

Release  
Date: December 8, 1998  
Release #: S.C. 48/98

## **SUMMARY OF CASES ACCEPTED DURING THE WEEK OF NOVEMBER 30, 1998**

[This news release is issued to inform the public and the press of cases that the Supreme Court has accepted and of their general subject matter. The description or descriptions set out below do not necessarily reflect the view of the court, or define the specific issues that will be addressed by the court.]

#98-162 Cortez v. Wilson, S074851. Original proceeding.

#98-163 Hotel Employees & Restaurant Employees International Union v. Wilson, S074850. Original proceeding.

These two cases concern whether Proposition 5 (1) exceeds the scope of the initiative power in requiring the Governor to enter into tribal gaming compacts, (2) violates California Constitution, article IV, section 19, subdivision (e), which prohibits "casinos of the type currently operating in Nevada and New Jersey," or (3) is preempted by the federal Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (IGRA), 25 U.S.C. section 2701 et seq.

#98-164 Morillion v. Royal Packing Co., S073725. (H017212; 66 Cal.App.4th 49.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed a judgment dismissing a civil action. This case is concerned with whether, for purposes of Industrial Welfare Commission order no. 14-80, "hours worked" includes time spent by employees riding to and from the actual work site in

(over)

employer-provided buses, when the employer requires its employees to travel in this manner.

#98-165 Palmer v. Truck Ins. Exchange, S074326. (B104376; 66 Cal.App.3d 916.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed in part and reversed in part a judgment dismissing a civil action. This case concerns whether, under Insurance Code section 533 and an insurance policy covering infringement of copyright or title but excluding infringement of trademark, the policy provided coverage for willful infringement of a trademarked business name.

#98-166 People v. Watts, S073741. (A080590, A080789; 66 Cal.App.4th 399.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses and dismissed an appeal from a related order. This case presents an issue, concerning whether the admission of evidence of prior acts of domestic violence to show propensity to commit such an offense violates due process, which is related to an issue before the court in People v. Falsetta, S071521 (#98-107), and People v. Ritson, S071200 (#98-108).

#